

42390P11668

PATENT

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully present Claims 1-30 for examination in the RCE filed herewith. Claims 1, 13, 19 and 26 have been amended herein to more clearly define the scope of the presently claimed invention. No new claims have been submitted. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims and remarks presented herein overcome the Examiner's rejections in the Final Office Action dated June 15, 2005 in the parent application.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Iwazaki, U.S. Patent No. 6,687,742 (hereafter "Iwazaki"). The Examiner submits that Iwazaki teaches all the elements of independent Claims 1, 8, 13, 19 and 26. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner submits that various sections of Iwazaki disclose all elements of the independent claims. For example, with respect to independent Claim 1, the Examiner submits that the element of "the second portion" is taught by Iwazaki, Col. 6, lines 28-54 and Col 11, lines 46-63. Applicant strongly disagrees. The sections highlighted by the Examiner read as follows:

"Here, an "X-Mailer:" field that indicates the device which has prepared this e-mail message and an "X-Ifax:" field that indicates the type of the e-mail message are added to the header. The fields starting with "X-" indicate user defined fields. This user defined field is defined in the standard e-mail format. A sequence of characters which represents identification information is described in a field which starts with "X-". Information indicating the local control method is described in the "X-Mailer:" field and information for identifying the type of an e-mail is described in the "X-Ifax:" field.

At the time of transmitting this e-mail, a response message from the receiver is requested. The following describes the case where MDN is used. A request for an MDN message is made by adding a "Disposition-Notification-To:" field to the header of an e-mail to be transmitted and describing an e-mail address for a response or the e-mail address of the sender in this field. If the receiver is designed for MDN, the receiver recognizes this field and returns an MDN message to the sender.

FIG. 4 shows one example of the generated e-mail message. Although an image of specific conditions is attached to the e-mail message, this e-mail message requests the capability

42390P11668

PATENT

of the receiver. The LAN controller 30 transmits this e-mail message to the e-mail address of the designated destination...." (Iwazaki, Col. 6, lines 28-54)

and

"The e-mail generator 25 describes a sequence of characters "Capability Request" in this tag so as to indicate that this TIFF file requests the capability of the receiver. The character sequence "Capability Request" is identification information that has been designed to be able to identify an Internet facsimile which executes the same control method as that of the local device. Note that the Image Description tag has only to be described in the IFD of the first page.

At the time of transmitting this e-mail attached with this TIFF file, a response message from the receiver is requested. The following describes the case where MDN, the standard system for e-mails, is used. A request for an MDN message is made by adding a "Disposition-Notification-To:" field to the header of an e-mail to be transmitted and describing an e-mail address for a response or the e-mail address of the sender in this field. If the receiver is designed for MDN, the receiver recognizes this field and returns an MDN message to the sender..." (Iwazaki, Col. 11, lines 46-63)

Applicant fails to see how any of these highlighted sections disclose the claimed "a second portion comprising a header with links to information capable of monitoring changes in the variable meta-data information, the information additionally capable of identifying a location of the electronic mail data within the electronic mail file". The Examiner points to these sections and makes the conclusory statement that these sections disclose the claimed element, but Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is mistaken. Specifically, there appears to be no disclosure of "a header with links to information capable of *monitoring changes* in the variable meta-data information". Additionally, there is no disclosure of "information additionally capable of identifying a *location* of the electronic mail data *within the electronic mail file*". Describing an email address, for example, does not correlate to the claimed element of identifying a location of the electronic mail data *within the electronic file*. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to clarify the Examiner's interpretation of these sections of Iwazaki. Barring that, Applicant maintains that Iwazaki does not disclose the claimed elements and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to Claim 1 and all claims dependent on Claim 1.

With respect to independent Claim 8, the Examiner once again states that the claim is rejected for the same reasons as Claim 1. The Examiner additionally suggests that Iwazaki

42390P11668

PATENT

combines "electronic mail data" and "variable meta-data information" in a single file, as claimed in Claim 8. The Examiner highlights the following section to support this contention:

"The receiver can identify identification information sent from the sender when the receiver is an Internet facsimile which carries out the same control method as that of the sender, or an Internet facsimile which comprises means for acquiring capability information of a transmission destination which is added to an e-mail, means for transmitting an image in the form of an e-mail under either of the condition of transmitting an image with fixed image conditions or the condition of transmitting an image according to the capability of the transmission destination, means for adding capability information to an e-mail, means for processing an image attached to an e-mail, means for adding identification information to an e-mail according to the standard e-mail format and means for identifying the identification information added to an e-mail" (Iwazaki, Col. 7, lines 13-27).

Applicant respectfully submits that Iwazaki does not teach the elements of Claim 8. Specifically, Iwazaki does not disclose combining into a single file electronic mail data and variable meta-data information, monitoring changes to the meta-data information with a header, and monitoring a location of the electronic mail data within the electronic mail file with the header. Although the Examiner mentions the above section of Iwazaki, the Examiner's text continues to rely on the rejection to Claim 1 for rejecting Claim 8. As discussed above, however, the sections highlighted by the Examiner to support the rejection to Claim 1, however, do not disclose any of these elements of amended Claim 8. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Iwazaki does not anticipate Claim 8,

With respect to independent Claims 13 and 19, both are directed to computer readable media. Again, the Examiner merely states that these claims mirror Claim 1 and relies on the sections of Iwazaki previously highlighted to support the rejection. Applicant strongly disagrees. Claims 13 and 19 are directed to a media capable of sending and receiving electronic mail files according to embodiments of the present invention. Iwazaki does not disclose at least the element of an electronic mail file comprising electronic mail data combined with meta-data information, the electronic mail file further comprising a header with links to the meta-data information and a location of the electronic mail data, as claimed in amended Claims 13 and 19. Iwazaki additionally does not disclose the remaining elements of both claims. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Iwazaki does not anticipate Claims 13 and 19.

42390P11668

PATENT

With respect to Claim 26, the Examiner suggests that portions of Col. 6 and Col. 7 of Iwazaki disclose the claimed elements. Again, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, as previously described, Iwazaki does not disclose at least the element of electronic mail file including combined electronic mail data and variable meta-data information, and a header containing links to the meta-data information and a location of the electronic mail data within the electronic mail file. The sections of Iwazaki highlighted by the Examiner do not disclose at least this element of amended Claim 26. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Iwazaki does not anticipate Claim 26.

Finally, with respect to all the dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that since these claims all depend on independent Claims Claims 1, 8, 13, 19 and 26, the dependent claims incorporate the elements not taught by Iwazaki. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Iwazaki also does not anticipate the dependant claims in the application. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections to pending Claims 1-30.

42390P11668

PATENT


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that pending Claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance in this case. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (714) 669-1261.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 14, 2005


Sharmini N. Green
Senior Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 41,410
(714) 669-1261